

LABOR POWER

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF THE SOCIALIST UNION PARTY

Volume 1

AUGUST, 1939

Number 4

HOUSING FOR WORKERS

C.I.O. INVADES BUILDING FIELD

THE FARMER VERSUS THE WORKER

THE A.F.L. PANICS SOKOLSKY

SOCIALISM AND THE SOUTH

THE W.P.A. PURGED AGAIN

THE BRIDGES CASE

ON THE UNION FRONT

SEEING RED

ORGANIZATION NOTES

CORRESPONDENCE

**Published by the Socialist Union Party,
1301 Boston Road, New York, N. Y.**

PRICE 5 CENTS

ORGANIZATION NOTES

SOCIALIST UNION PARTY

Acting at the behest of the Brandon clique, the capitalist state power, functioning through the medium of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, compelled the majority of the membership to relinquish the name "Industrial Union Party."

To fill this void, the party membership has selected a new name—SOCIALIST UNION PARTY—by which it will be known hereafter.

Address all communications to—
Socialist Union Party
1301 Boston Road
New York, N. Y.

Editorial matters concerning LABOR POWER, official organ of the party, should be addressed to the Editorial Board, P. O. Box 4, Station T, New York, N. Y.

FLYING FALSE COLORS

The Brandon minority clique, now in control of the Industrial Union Party, is discovering that their "victory" in the capitalist courts, to which they appealed when they faced repudiation at the hands of the party membership, is proving to be a boomerang.

In an effort to bolster up the fast-waning spirits of their dupes and to uphold the fiction of being a national organization, they are resorting to their customary duplicity and falsification—this time listing in the official directory of their organ, the "Industrial Unionist", the names of Branches and members which have categorically repudiated them and their policies.

Among others, they list Minneapolis and its Organizer, Mrs. William Nelson. In order that there may be no further confusion on this score and knowing full well that one is judged by the company one keeps, Mrs. Nelson has addressed a scathing letter of rebuke to these people, which is not likely to appear in the correspondence column of their paper.

The letter follows:—

"Minneapolis, Minn.
July 24th, 1939

Mr. Sam Brandon,
New York, N. Y.

Dear Comrade:

Your correspondence in regard to your subscription drive and in regard to financial support has been received.

On May 29th, I wrote you that Branch Minneapolis had voted to sever all connections with your organization. The court decision could not change our convictions. You won the Party name, it is true, but that victory could not give you back the confidence you have lost. Your act in dragging a principled revolutionary working class dispute into the capitalist court has made us lose all faith in your revolutionary integrity.

Any further appeal therefore, to the Minneapolis comrades for support will only be wasted effort on your part. The comrades here have definitely taken a stand in favor of the policies represented by Comrade Ziegler and his group. Any support, financial or otherwise that we are able to give will go towards the building up of the new party.

The statement sent you May 29th, was an official statement from Branch Minneapolis; still in spite of this statement you persist in listing Branch Minneapolis in the official directory of the "Industrial Unionist" as published by your group. The flaunting of my name under these circumstances does not seem quite honest. Why should you list Branch Minneapolis at all when you know that the Branch here is no longer a part of your organization?

My name on your official publication can only cause confusion. I am therefore asking that you discontinue any further notice of this kind.

Yours for Industrial Unionism,
(Signed) Mrs. Wm. Nelson."

The "capitalist court" revolutionists of the Industrial Union Party also list Branch Los Angeles and Comrade A. C. Booth, of San Francisco, Cal. in their official directory as belonging to their party.

(Continued on page 19)

LABOR POWER

Published Monthly by the
SOCIALIST UNION PARTY

1301 Boston Road
NEW YORK, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD
B. Robbins, A. Levine, F. Pierson

Subscription: — Per Year, 50c; Semi-
Annually, 25c; Single Copy, 5c.

Composed & Printed by Voluntary Labor

Vol. 1, No. 4 August, 1939

Editorials . . .

THE ASSAULT ON THE W.P.A.

The wholesale purge of the workers on the W.P.A. which had been threatened ever since the Roosevelt Administration early this year requested a one-third cut in the annual appropriation, began in earnest on July 1st when the provisions of the 1940 Relief Act took effect. First to feel the new provisions were the skilled workers, mostly on construction projects, who found themselves compelled to work 130 hours a month for \$85.20 in place of the old arrangement under which they worked only the number of hours which, at prevailing union rates, were necessary to equal the \$84 salary they received.

This change amounted to a wage cut of more than 50% in most cases. Refusing to accept it, skilled workers began walking off their jobs and appealing to the Building Trades Unions to back them up. The union leadership, realizing the importance of maintaining the scale on government work, took over the conduct of the strike, which is still in effect at this writing. W.P.A. construction throughout the country was effectively halted by the solid picket lines. At many points the strikers clashed with police, and in Minneapolis all W.P.A. projects were halted because of the antagonism between the workers and the Administration. In an attempt to force the strikers to return to work, the five-day

rule was invoked, under which any worker absent for five consecutive days was to be dismissed at once. Despite the firing of over 25,000 men, 13,000 in the New York area alone, the strikers are still holding their lines firm.

Next to feel the brunt of the new law were those who had been continuously employed for 18 months and who were compelled to take a so-called 30-day furlough. This actually amounts to permanent dismissal in most cases. Under the law, those laid off can be re-employed only after they qualify again for home relief, are again certified for a job to the W.P.A., and then wait until all those on the lists before them have been given jobs. So great were the protests when this rule was put into effect, that late in July an amendment was passed in the Senate repealing the provisions. On the strength of this rider, Colonel Harrington, W.P.A. Administrator, suspended further dismissals until Congress took final action.

Of those dismissed, only about two-thirds were replaced by new workers, in accordance with the original scheme to reduce the total number of workers from 3 million to 2 million before the end of the year. In addition to this, the Federal Theatre project was abolished altogether, throwing several thousand workers out of work in one of the most useful and popular projects.

There is still more to come, to add to the miseries of the W.P.A. unfortunates. The writers, music, art and sculpture projects will be abolished after August 31st unless they obtain local sponsors, similar to construction projects. After December 31st, all sponsors must contribute not less than 25% of the cost of the projects. In view of the near-bankruptcy of most of the nation's State and municipal governments, this means a severe curtailment of W.P.A. work in the future. But perhaps the most pernicious of all the clauses which are about to be put into effect is one providing for abolition of wage differentials between sections of the country, except for differences in living costs. What this means may be understood by citing the example of unskilled workers in New York City who get about \$60.50 a month, while in

some southern states they get only \$26 a month. According to the law, this difference must be done away with, so that all workers receive about a \$42 average.

It certainly is about time that the southern workers received a wage increase which would allow them to obtain a few more of the necessities of life. On the other hand there is absolutely no justification for cutting the wages of the northern workers by approximately one-third, as must inevitably occur under the law, causing a tremendous drop in their living standards.

These are the bounties already visited or about to be visited upon the W.P.A. workers and their families, comprising about 8 million people, by the action of President Roosevelt and the Democratic-controlled Congress, who have been touted to the skies as the "friends" of labor. Yet, in the present state of capitalism in the United States, such moves are no more than to be expected. The government's mounting deficit can never be met with tax revenues at their present levels, and no administration will dare attempt to impose new ones on the complaining capitalists. The only way out for the administration is to cut expenditures for relief and similar purposes, and then to slash the salaries of government employees. The prospects ahead for the unemployed are very unpleasant indeed, until the working class takes action on its own behalf and abolishes capitalism with all its miseries.

In the meantime, how has labor met the current assault on the W.P.A.? The skilled workers on strike have been under the leadership of the Building Trades Unions of the A.F.L., which have conducted a fairly militant struggle against the wage cuts. Toward the end of the month, the aid of the Teamsters Union was obtained, and deliveries of material to construction projects were halted. An emergency meeting of A.F.L. leaders in Washington, called early in July to deal with the situation, contented itself with passing resolutions condemning the cuts and threatening reprisals at the polls next election to all congressmen who did not vote to restore the prevailing wage rule. William Green blew hot and cold on the strike, stating first that "Today the only thing the work-

ing man can do is to resort to his economic strength — which means strikes and strikes," and changing his tune two days later to the statement that the remedy "lies with Congress rather than through strikes on W.P.A. projects."

The C.I.O., whose members were not particularly affected by the prevailing wage repeal, voted support to the skilled workers' strike, but this was little more than a gesture. The Workers Alliance, the W.P.A. Teachers Union, and other relief workers' groups, voted to stop work on July 20th in protest against the new law and in support of the skilled workers on strike. This proved a fizzle, however, when only a small fraction of the W.P.A. workers walked off the job. It is evident that the Stalinist-dominated organizations do not have quite as much influence as they boast. Perhaps this may be laid to the fact that the relief workers have become disgusted with those who urged them to support an administration which cuts their wages and fires them wholesale.

The way out for the relief workers is independent action in cooperation with the unions of employed workers to show the government and the capitalist class that they do not intend to accept without a murmur, the attempts to reduce their status to that of coolies. Only solidarity of all of labor's forces will convince the capitalist politicians that they can no longer safely carve chunks out of their living standards.

THE BRIDGES CASE

After several years of delay, the efforts of the reactionary anti-labor forces on the West Coast to secure the deportation of Harry Bridges, head of the Longshoremen's Union and C.I.O. Regional Director, have finally reached their climax. For several weeks hearings have been conducted by the Federal Department of Labor to determine whether Bridges should be expelled from the country because of alleged membership in an organization advocating the overthrow of the government by force and violence.

Most of the government witnesses who testified to having been fellow members of the Communist Party with Bridges,

have been exposed as undercover agents for the American Legion or for various employers' groups, who entered the C.P. to act as agents provocateur. In that fact lies the significance of these hearings. They are not being held primarily to oust a "dangerous" radical, preaching force and violence. If that were their purpose, then the attempt to prove these charges against Bridges by citing membership in the Communist Party is a joke. That organization is a legal party in a nation where every one on the 48 states as well as the Federal government have laws outlawing the preaching of force and violence. Moreover, the line of the C.P. since 1934, when Bridges first became known to the public, has become more and more innocuous, until today it is nothing more than the left wing of the Democratic Party. Certainly, even if Bridges is a member of the C.P. that constitutes no ground for deportation.

The real purpose of the hearings is to undermine the confidence of the workers on the Pacific Coast in their unions, particularly the C.I.O. membership, by discrediting one of the most prominent figures in its ranks. Beginning with the General Strike in San Francisco in 1934, labor has been increasingly militant, resisting the onslaughts of the employers more and more, and extending its organization into new fields. The spearhead of this movement has been the C.I.O. The employers reason that if Bridges, its chief spokesman, could be eliminated by deportation, the spirit of the workers might be weakened.

The workers of the West Coast must not permit the reactionaries to get away with this move without protest. Once the employers succeed in deporting Bridges on framed-up evidence their position in the fight against the workers will be immeasurably strengthened. They will be encouraged to new and more despicable frame-ups to get rid of labor leaders in whom the workers have confidence. Vehement protest against the hearings will show the bosses that the workers have not been taken in by their tricky maneuvers.

As for Bridges himself, no worker should allow his sympathy because of the attempted frame-up to blind him to

Bridges' treachery to the interests of his class. Whether or not he is actually a member of the Communist Party, Bridges has been carrying out its line ever since his entrance into the American labor movement. This means that those in the union who would not submit to C.P. domination would be discriminated against and attacked. It means that other unions which opposed such tactics would be deserted and even scabbed upon. It was only last year that Bridges led his longshoremen through the Sailors Union picket lines because the S.U.P. had dared challenge Bridges' attempted domination of West Coast shipping and his attempt at supporting dual unionism in the shape of Joe Curran's N.M.U. During all this time Bridges was quite ready and anxious to play ball with the Committee of 43, San Francisco representatives of the employers, with whom he boasted that he "got along fine."

All of Bridges' organizing ability and his militancy are valueless to the workers, and in fact quite harmful, because he has perverted his talents to the service of 'Stalinism. The workers must defend him against the attempts of the employers to deport him by a legal frame-up; but at the same time they must continue their fight on the West Coast for democracy and rank and file control of the unions, against the opposition of the Stalinist cliques under Bridges' leadership.

The Party Line: "Mr. Sheean is not a Communist, though he is willing to give credit to what he considers the organizing genius of the Communists in Spain; he does not believe the International Brigade or very many Spaniards fought for communism during the recent war; and he is quite willing to admit that outrages were committed by Anarchists within Republican Lines during the initial period of disorder which followed the outbreak of 1936."—R. L. Duffus, reviewing Vincent Sheean's new book for the N. Y. *Times*.

Now, supposing, hypothetical, of course, Sheean were a Communist, what would he have said?

THE FARMER VERSUS THE WORKER

DURING the recent hearings before the Senate Labor Committee on the proposed amendments to the Wagner Labor Relations Act, a number of farm group lobbyists bitterly attacked the National Labor Relations Board for its alleged "interference" in farm labor disputes, and called for changes in the law which would definitely remove the farmers from the jurisdiction of the N.L.R.B. and assure them of unlimited right to exploit their help.

While the industrialists, bankers and representatives of the Chambers of Commerce throughout the country find it necessary to employ a certain amount of guile and subtlety to mask their opposition to the act, the farmers come out frankly and openly for the divine right to extract the last ounce of profit from the labor of their "hands" without hindrance from anyone. The testimony of the farm representatives, as reported in an Associated Press dispatch to the *New York Times* is quite revealing:

Fred Brenckman, legislative representative of the National Grange, told the Senate Labor Committee today the National Labor Board was "flouting the clear intent of Congress" in its rulings pertaining to agriculture . . .

"The failure of the National Labor Relations Board to recognize the exemption of agricultural labor imposes a severe hardship upon agriculture," Mr. Brenckman added.

"The situation increases the farmer's marketing costs and destroys the morale of those employed in the packing plants.

"It likewise interferes with the speedy movement of perishable products, the value of which is lessened or destroyed unless they are moved promptly."

Mr. Brenckman was one of a group of witnesses for farm groups who testified in support of an amendment by Senator Logan, Democrat, of Kentucky, to define agricultural labor.

Howard Sheppard of Cedarville, N. J., representing the New Jersey Farm Bureau, contended that handlers

of fruits could not operate and at the same time "dicker with union labor" because of the perishable nature of the commodity.

He proposed that there be enacted "restrictions around union activities of men engaged in transporting perishables."

W. A. Stanford of Lake Alfred, Fla., testifying for the United Growers and Shippers, urged that fruit pickers and handlers be exempted from the act.

Curiously enough, the report of the farmers' testimony followed by only one day the publication of a book, "Factories in the Field," in which a first-hand observer of farm conditions, Carey McWilliams, Commissioner of Immigration and Housing in California, reports on the horrible conditions under which the migratory workers labor in the fertile valleys of his native state.

Mr. McWilliams tells of the stranglehold of the large landholders and farmers on the State and local governments in California; of the vigilante terror organized by the Associated Farmers to quell any protest of the workers against their miserable conditions and to bulldoze and drive out any union organizers who have the temerity to invade their territory; of

No Cuts in This Educational Program.

"Ten industrialists, serving without pay, will help the government distribute educational orders among munitions manufacturers if Congress appropriates funds for the program. (An educational order is one given to a potential war materials manufacturer to enable him to meet possible wartime demands.)

"With \$2,000,000 appropriated last year, some educational orders already have been given six plants for semi-automatic rifles, gas masks, shell forgings and machinings, recoil mechanisms for anti-aircraft guns and searchlights." —Associated Press dispatch from Washington, June 12th.

the barbed-wire concentration camps which have been set up to force workers to work long hours under the hottest sun for the merest pittance.

One New York reviewer, commenting on the book, reports that "One of the things I can't forget about 'Factories in the Field' is the fact that God and law and order seemed to have been all on the side of the 'embattled farmers,' the 'farmers' being mainly large corporations.

"It was bad enough," concludes this reviewer, "in the World War, hysteria being what it was, for large, organized and industrialized farms to call upon women and girls to man the profiteering large-scale farms while the men were at the front, to take boys and girls out of school and deaf mutes out of asylums to work for low wages in their fields; however, demanding that thousands be dropped from relief rolls to work at less than dole wages in orchards—and getting those thousands—seemed to me, somehow, an even more lamentable sign-post."

That the rural capitalist, the farmer, is a merciless exploiter of labor and will brook no opposition to his "right of exploitation" is a fact, the social significance of which seems to have escaped or been ignored by certain sections of the American labor movement.

Among certain so-called revolutionaries, taking their guidance from Lenin and the Bolsheviks, it seems to have become an article of faith that the American worker must woo the farmers to gain his support in order to achieve the overthrow of the capitalist class. Workers are solemnly assured that the farmer is a natural ally of the worker whose aid must be won by formulating special demands for him, and treating him nicely after the workers have seized power. "That's how it happened in Russia," is their favorite reply to those who question the merits of this formula for proletarian success.

It is quite true that the peasantry in Russia played an important role in the triumph of the revolution. To begin with, they composed 80% of the population and they controlled the food supplies without which the city workers could have been starved out. Economically, the peas-

antry were exploited by the feudal landowners; politically, they groaned under the heavy yoke of the oppressive Czarist bureaucracy which ruled over them. The great majority of them were landless, and did not exploit wage labor. Under these circumstances, it was possible to get the peasantry to join hands with the workers in throwing off the weight of the exploiters, both feudal and bourgeois.

But even in the case of Russia the support rendered by the peasantry was purely an historical accidental phenomenon, upon which the Bolsheviks placed no advance reliance whatever. Trotsky's "History of the Russian Revolution" quotes Lenin on April 24, 1917 in a party conference as stating, "It is not permissible for a proletarian party to rest its hopes at this time on a community of interest with the peasantry." In other words, while Lenin was not averse to securing the masses of the peasantry as allies to the workers, he based his real hopes only on the independent action of the working class.

In the United States, however, we are confronted with an entirely different setup. In the first place, the compelling factor of political oppression is non-existent as far as the farmer is concerned. Sec-

When Democracy Goes Too Far. "... And yet the raising of this question [the attainment of a planned economy] so fundamental in the relation of classes, is the greatest threat to the existence of democracy because it disturbs vested interests whose acceptance of democratic institutions has hitherto been based on the fact that they could use such institutions for their own benefit . . .

"The number of bills in national and state legislatures tending to curb this freedom in respect to economic matters, or to suppress associations committed to economic change, is appalling."—Robert Morss Lovett, Chicago writer and educator, recently appointed U. S. Secretary to the Virgin Islands, speaking before the National Conference for Social Work.

ondly, the so-called "small" farmer who is the special object of attention of the American Leninists owns both land and machinery, and is an exploiter of labor. Thus he is part and parcel of the capitalist class, on the opposite side of the fence from the worker, and can in no way be compared to the pre-revolutionary peasant in Russia.

It is true that the farmer is himself victimized by the top sections of the capitalist class, by means of high mortgage rates, high tariffs and prices on machinery which he uses, and low prices on his produce. All this does not make him an enemy of capitalism, but only of its top layer. The farmer is much more concerned that his vital power to work his laborers long hours for little pay is not infringed upon. This accounts for the murderous fury of the farmers when agricultural labor dares to rebel, as was witnessed in Salinas, California, in Hershey, Pennsylvania, in the Lakeland Creamery strike in Minnesota and in the pecan shellers' strike in Texas. Hence also the campaign to exempt agricultural labor from the provisions of the Wagner Act.

The conclusion is plain: the farmer is a rural capitalist and an implacable enemy of the working class. Here and there, where his own interests are not directly affected, the farmer can be temporarily neutralized in a struggle between the industrial capitalist and his workers; but in the long run the farmer will side with his fellow exploiters against the working class. Therefore, no halfway measures or

Don't Lose Heart, Boys—Here's a Job for Everyone! "There are still plenty of jobs in the world. They are not the same jobs your grandfathers had, but there is much work to be done. It is true there are no more rails to be split, but there are lots of molecules." —Dr. James S. Thomas, president of Clarkson College, to graduating class at Owen D. Young Model Rural School.

compromises with the farmer are permissible. Any attempt to win his support by concessions to his petty-bourgeois property-owning instincts can only result in undermining the solidarity and morale of the proletariat, breed confusion among the workers, and lead ultimately to defeat.

In its program of action, a Marxist party can make no distinction between agricultural production and industrial production, between rural capitalists and urban capitalists. Socialism will spell the elimination of all social classes. Socialism will establish a co-ordinated system of industrial and agricultural production without creating artificial exceptions for farmers.

The American working class, industrial and agricultural, needs no allies to insure the success of its struggle for emancipation. Composed of the vast majority of the population, it possesses within itself the necessary power to put an end to the exploitation of man by man, and the dominance of the capitalist class over society.

For the millions of impoverished sharecroppers, tenant farmers and non-exploiting farmers, the marginal producers for whom there is no room in the capitalist scheme of things and who are condemned to a life of increasing misery and privation, there is but one way of escape: to unite their efforts with those of the workers on the basis of the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and the rearing of the Socialist Republic with all the means of production in the hands of society, for the benefit of society.

The Capitalist Creed. "Cruelty, selfishness, lust, cowardice and deceit are normal ingredients of human nature which have their useful role in the struggle for existence. Intrinsically, they are all virtues. It is only their excess or their exercise under wrong conditions that justly incurs our disapproval."—Dr. S. J. Holmes in an address before the Association for the Advancement of Science.

HOUSING FOR WORKERS

IT IS an ill wind that blows nobody good, runs the old adage; even the bankrupt New Deal, which, despite all its attempted reforms, has completely failed to put a dent in the army of unemployed, has performed a useful function in exposing the miserable conditions under which vast numbers of Americans live. It was President Roosevelt who dramatized the plight of "one-third of a nation" who were "ill-clothed, ill-housed and ill-fed," in his fireside chats to millions of radio listeners. That the New Deal failed to find a remedy despite all its brain trusters, was due to its inability to go outside the bounds of capitalism and private property.

Take the question of housing, for example. The United States Housing Authority was set up by the Administration for the purpose of stimulating the construction of municipal low-rent housing by means of education and government subsidies. It has issued a number of booklets containing a mine of information on housing conditions. One of these, entitled, *What Housing Can Do for Your City*, gives an appalling picture of the disease-breeding, sub-standard slum conditions under which millions of city dwellers live. Here we learn that:

Until a very few years ago the facts about housing conditions were so scattered and incomplete that no conclusions could be drawn from them. It was still generally assumed that every honest worker willing to work would sooner or later be able to acquire one of the bright dream cottages of the advertising pages and live happily ever after. But in 1933 the Department of Commerce made a real property inventory covering 64 cities in every state in the Union. A rural housing survey was also made. The result of this painstaking effort shocked the country out of its easy optimism.

It was conclusively shown that one-third of the homes of the nation were definitely below any standard which could be accepted as "decent"

or "American" and that at least one-tenth were dangerously unsafe. All of these sub-standard dwellings lacked the most elementary sanitary facilities and conveniences and were so overcrowded as to threaten the treasured individuality of family life . . .

But that was in 1938. What is the present situation? The booklet tells us:

Today figures are available for 204 localities, covering more than five million residential buildings and more than eight million households, or more than half the urban families in the U. S. Some of the more salient figures may be summarized as follows:

Structural Condition: About 1,100,000 homes in the 8,300,000 buildings had such serious structural defects that they were unsafe or absolutely unfit for use.

Sanitary Facilities: 1,661,000 homes, about one-fifth of the total, had no private bathing facilities. 1,221,000 were without private indoor water closets.

Privacy and Overcrowding: 850,000 families were doubled up, that is, shared their homes with other families. Over 1,300,000 homes were crowded, that is, had more than one person per room.

The Senate Committee on Education and Labor, which reported favorably on the bill to create the Housing Authority, conceded that these conditions were not the result of the depression, but that even before 1929, "... over ten million families in America, or more than forty million people, were subjected to housing conditions that did not adequately protect their health and safety."

The investigation concluded by the Authority uncovered the ravages to life and health caused by overcrowding in the slums. "In Detroit there were almost three times as many cases of pneumonia per 100,000 population in a slum area chosen for clearance as in the city as a whole and over six times as much tuber-

culosis. In Tampa, in a slum area district known as the 'Scrub' the death rate was 17.2 per 1,000 population compared with 4.5 for the rest of the city and the disease rate was 23.8 against 4.8. In Cleveland 13% of the deaths from tuberculosis occurred in a slum area which covered only 0.73% of the area of the city and contained only 2.4% of the city's population."

These are the conditions under which workers live in the greatest capitalist nation in the world. What is the solution?

The New Deal program of subsidized low-rent housing, as embodied in the law creating the United States Housing Authority does nothing more than scratch the surface of the problem. The Authority concerns itself with the plight of only a small minority of the slum dwellers, those who are steadily employed in private industry and are good business risks. "The immediate purpose of public housing is to raise the living standards of typically employed families of very low incomes who are independent and self-supporting . . . It is agreed both here and abroad that housing projects, once they are set up at the lowest rentals feasible, must be operated on a businesslike basis."

There can be no misunderstanding here. The 30 millions who constitute the unemployed and those dependent on relief are definitely left out of the better housing picture. Low rent housing is not for them! Insofar as the New Deal reformers are concerned, they can continue to live in the squalid, disease-breeding "homes" they now occupy. And this despite all the high-minded motives behind the housing program.

Why this contradiction between the fine words of the New Deal and their petty deeds? The reason is that President Roosevelt and his followers are hedged in by the bounds of capitalism. They cannot appropriate funds to tear down all the slums and to furnish decent housing conditions for all, for that would bankrupt the capitalist class. Therefore their proposals must be "businesslike;" that is, they must not spend money unless they are certain it will be returned.

But the housing problem goes deeper

than merely a question of spending a few billion dollars. Why do people live in the miserable slums which infest every town and city in the United States? Certainly it is not a matter of choice. The fact is that slum dwellers cannot pay the rents necessary to provide better homes for themselves. If not unemployed and dependent on the "generosity" of the government for their subsistence, they are working for employers anxious to exploit them to the utmost for the least possible wages. Thus the slums cannot be done away with unless at the same time the basic evil of capitalist exploitation is abolished. The goal of better housing, "a life worth living," is attainable only under Socialism.

Even were it possible to envisage the elimination of the slums under capitalism, the workers would still face the problem of unemployment, and of earning enough wages to pay the rent. In other words, our primary job as workers is to resist the exploitation of the employers and the onslaughts of the capitalist government. Don't let us be sidetracked by capitalist politicians who seek to get us excited by the wonders of low-cost, low-rent housing. Let us remember the fate of the workers of Vienna, who boasted of their model apartment houses, built by the Social Democratic city administration. When the time came to face the capitalist politicians Dollruss who set out to destroy them, the workers found that they had made progress in the wrong direction. Unprepared to resist the fascist attacks, the Viennese workers were slaughtered; and the scene of their biggest butchery was, ironically enough, the Karl Marx Apartment Hof, the pride of the Social Democrats.

—ABRAHAM ZIEGLER

CORRESPONDENCE

TO LABOR POWER:

The following information may help you to understand recent events in District No. 9 of the Painters, Paperhangers and Decorators Union in New York City

which led the membership to defeat the Stalinist candidate for Secretary-Treasurer, the highest post in the District Council, after four years of uninterrupted Stalinist domination.

The Weinstock administration spent more than \$700,000 in that period, yet, despite this, comparatively little new work was organized. On the contrary, a great deal of work has been lost to union labor, the speed-up still prevails on many jobs and the kick-back to the boss is quite common. The Progressive candidate won on a platform calling for a democratic, efficient and economical administration, an intensive organizing campaign, abolition of the speed-up and strict enforcement of all union rules and regulations.

Added to the other grievances against the Stalinists was dissatisfaction over the mismanagement of the union's treasury. At a time when there was virtual starvation among most of the members due to very wide unemployment, the Stalinists saw fit to add to the office force many unneeded clerks whose salaries came out of the pockets of the impoverished rank and file. It was generally recognized throughout the union that these office workers were fellow Stalinists who were pushed in, not because they were needed for the union's affairs, but to give them soft jobs at comparatively good salaries.

Complaints against the Weinstock administration were numerous because of its policy of favoring Communist Party supporters when jobs were given out. At the time the so-called "25% Clause" was effective, a clause which was intended to have 25% of the men on all jobs placed through the District Council office, rules were established by which preference was to be given at all times to pickets, through a regular rotating plan. It was soon noted that despite the rules, Stalinist supporters were getting most of the jobs, and the best ones. Many members complained that men ran back of them on the list were getting jobs before them.

A typical story was the complaint of one painter who charged that he had picketed forty-five times and then had been assigned to a job on which he was employed for three days before being

laid off. He discovered that work on the job had not been completed but that another painter had been sent from the District Council office to replace him. Another picket complained that he had been assigned to a very poor job after having picketed the stipulated quota of twenty times, whereas a Stalinist who had not completed his picketing quota had been given a much better job.

In an effort to show that the administration was attempting to organize the unorganized, Weinstock presented a plan by which maintenance painters employed in hotels and large apartment houses would be organized at a much lower wage scale than that prevailing under the regular union agreement. After a long battle, the plan was rejected by the membership who feared that acceptance of workers at a lower scale would serve as an excuse for the employers to attack the existing agreement. The fight over this issue was another incident which caused the Stalinists to lose favor with the union membership.

The defeat suffered in the election of June 24th was indicated when, for the second time in two years, Weinstock failed to get the nomination for the Secretary-Treasurership in his own local. J. T. Stevens, leader of the Progressives won by more than 400 votes out of 700. This made it necessary to nominate a Stalinist in another local and Morris Gainer was named. A third candidate, Business Agent Pasini, who had been elected with Weinstock's support last year, also ran on an independent ticket. Out of 7,220 votes cast, Stevens got 3,101, a plurality of 279 over Gainer's 2,822, with Pasini receiving only 519.

In preparing for the election the administration was defeated in its attempt to hold the voting in an out-of-the-way armory as they did last year. They were compelled to hold the election in a centrally-located armory in the heart of the city, thus making it more easily accessible for the majority of the membership.

**DON'T FORGET THE SUBSCRIPTION
DRIVE FOR "LABOR POWER"**

This defeat gives the Stalinists a serious setback in the New York area, inasmuch as it breaks their hold on a union which has been leading their united front May Day parades for the past few years. It is to be hoped that the painters follow through by ousting the rest of the wrecking crew which has prevented progress in New York.

—UNION PAINTER

ON THE UNION FRONT

POLITICIANS ARE STILL POLITICIANS

After being bombarded with many protests by union sympathizers, Governor Lehman of New York vetoed the Bewley Bill which was designed to virtually outlaw strikes by the Teamsters' Union. The bill as passed by the Legislature made it a felony to restrain by coercion or threats of violence a "person's right to work as a driver of a motortruck" As the governor stated, in his message accompanying the veto, this provision could be so interpreted as to cripple the union's strike activities.

The fight made by the Teamster's Brotherhood against this attempt to destroy their union should prove once again how futile it is for workers to depend on politicians to help their cause. Nine of the State Senators who voted in favor of the union-busting Bewley bill were Democrats who had been endorsed by the A.F. of L. Today, in a tone of outraged innocence, the Teamsters' official organ charges them with a "monstrous offence against organized labor." Thomas Lyons, president of the New York City Central Trades and Labor Council said in a statement to the press, "The Brotherhood of Teamsters and all other A.F.L. unions throughout the State, and particularly in New York City, are absolutely nauseated by the vile and shameful action of these cynical betrayers of labor." But Mr. Lyons was exaggerating just a trifle; these politicians were just performing their natu-

ral function of protecting the employers against the workers. If any betrayal took place, it was carried out by those A.F.L. labor leaders who endorsed the politicians in the first place and persuaded other workers to vote them into office.

As for Governor Lehman's veto, let no worker deceive himself into believing that this proves him to be a friend of labor. In his veto message the Governor stated that he was rejecting the bill not because he disagreed with its substance but because its language could be misinterpreted. It should be remembered that only a year ago Governor Lehman vetoed the infamous red baiting McNaboe Bill calling for the ousting of all civil service employees who "advocate the doctrine that the government of the United States or any state be overthrown by violence." This year, in slightly altered form, he signed this same measure under the name of the Devaney Bill, thus subjecting all liberal and radical workers in the civil service or the public schools to the threat of constant persecution and the loss of their jobs at the hands of reactionary bigots.

Once more the lesson to the workers is clear. Only their own independent class conscious organization in opposition to the politicians of the ruling class can serve their interests.

Daniel De Leon

"The only man who has added anything to Socialist theory since Marx and Engels."

—N. Lenin.

All workers owe it to themselves to become acquainted with the works of one who is universally conceded to be America's foremost revolutionist and Marxian theoretician. Knowledge is power!

We recommend:—

Reform and Revolution 5c
Socialist Industrial Unionism 10c
What Means This Strike? 5c
Send all orders to: P.O. Box No. 4,
Station T, New York, N. Y.

THE A.F.L. PANICS SOKOLSKY

OF ALL the attacks levelled against the skilled workers who walked off the job when the W.P.A. abolished the prevailing wages rule, perhaps one of the most virulent came from the pen of the notorious George E. Sokolsky, *New York Herald Tribune* "calumnist." This expert red baiter specializes in attacking labor whenever it makes the slightest move towards resisting the attacks of the employers on their standards of living. A renegade anarchist, Sokolsky has set himself up as an authority on the radical movement. Like the reformed drunkard who is very much in demand at prohibition meetings, Sokolsky is very popular with the "better" classes and has achieved quite a reputation as a writer, lecturer and radio propagandist for big business.

While most journalists make a studied attempt to appear impartial in their comments, Sokolsky makes no bones about where he stands. When the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee revealed him as being on the payroll of the National Association of Manufacturers in the capacity of "public relations counsel," Sokolsky openly defended his "right" to sell his advice to the highest bidder.

The W.P.A. strike offered Sokolsky a splendid opportunity for his favorite subject of attack and in his July 24th column he burst forth with unsurpassed venom against what he called "The W.P.A. Revolution."

It seems to me [he wrote] that the significant fact in the W.P.A. strike is that those who led it engaged in an act of revolution. They struck, not against an employer, but against an act of Congress. They substituted direct action for the ballot which is our only formal method of expressing opposition to acts of Congress. They substituted mass demonstration for the right of petition. They sought to intimidate the Congress by a mass strike.

After calling President Roosevelt's attention to the danger of such "intimidation" and cautioning him to guard against a recurrence of the fate that overtook Kerensky in Russia, the article continues:

The issues of the current trouble are immaterial. All that matters is the procedure. We live in the United States by a certain procedure, called representative government. We elect a Congress which governs us. We elect a President who administers the law as enacted by Congress. The members of Congress are subject to the will of the people as expressed, first, at elections and secondly, by petition . . . But there is no procedure in this country for direct action by the people against the Congress.

Sokolsky then concludes his diatribe in the characteristic manner of a reformed radical by lumping together the ultra-conservative A.F.L. building trades workers who conducted the W.P.A. strike with the Communist-controlled Workers Alliance, with foreign and domestic plotters and conspirators, and calling upon Congress to take appropriate action against these revolutionary scoundrels. This section reads almost like a *Daily Worker* amalgam.

It has been written that even a blind mouse can sometimes find a grain of corn. Strange as it may seem, Sokolsky has for once hit the nail on the head, in emphasizing the fact that the significance of the W.P.A. strike goes beyond the question of the strikers' demands, and that it constitutes a challenge to the existing government. It is not that the strike is a conscious and deliberate revolutionary act on the part of the strikers or their "business" leadership. Far from it. These skilled building trades workers on strike are among the most conservative section of the A.F.L., which in turn has established itself in the undisputed position of being the most conservative labor organization in the world.

That's What They Tell Us Here, Too. The watchword of the Hitler Youth Organization in the Third Reich is, "Do your duty and keep your mouth shut." Pretty familiar, eh?

These workers have been as far removed from the taint of Communism as is Mr. Sokolsky himself today. In fact it was the conservative *Wall Street Journal* which many years ago eulogized the A.F.L. as a "bulwark against Socialism" in this country. What is revolutionary in the strikers conduct is not their conscious intent, nor the act of striking itself, but the implications which lie behind these.

By their action, this group of ultra-conservative and violently anti-red craft unionists have recognized that they cannot rely on the good will or promises of the political "friends of labor;" that whenever a contest arises between the interests of the workers and those of their employers, the government is no longer "their" government; and that, in fact, all of the machinery of the government is turned against them and employed in the interests of their capitalist exploiters.

In the face of almost universal condemnation from the press, and a concerted attempt by the politicians to intimidate them against "striking against the government," the workers took this unprecedented step and stood their ground.

In so doing the strikers recognized, even though only instinctively, that in the face of the serious crisis confronting them their only hope lay in their own class action and the solidarity of their fellow workers; on what Sokolsky calls "direct action" and not in the political servants of the capitalist class. That is the revolutionary significance of the strike.

* * * *

Sokolsky's article attempts to emphasize the heinousness of the strikers' offense by contrasting their conduct with the "correct" attitude taken by the employers when the Wagner Act was passed. Though they bitterly opposed the act (they "were certain that it would prove to be the fiasco that it is," according to to Sokolsky) they didn't go on strike against an act of Congress. Not those patriots! "The great national organization of employers conducted a constant agitation among the people for change in the act."

(Among the instrumentalities of this "legal" agitation was Mr. Sokolsky himself, who used the columns of the *Herald Tribune* to attack the law as well as its New Deal sponsors, and to get in as many digs at labor as he could. Together with the canned speeches which he recorded for free distribution to small radio stations throughout the country, these writings well earned for Mr. Sokolsky the handsome fee which the National Association of Manufacturers paid him. He is certainly one man who can boast that America is the land of opportunity.)

To return to the argument: Yes, Mr. Sokolsky, the employers, your employers, do not conduct strikes against the government to obtain redress for their grievances. But why should they? IT IS THEIR GOVERNMENT! They can always depend upon it to back them up with police, militia and courts against the workers. If through mischance an administration is installed which does not agree with them on policies to be followed, the employers are well aware that they can replace it sooner or later with more obliging politicians.

By the same token the workers have learned that the government isn't theirs, that it is in truth the representative of the employing class. Well may the Sokolskys and their ilk fill the air with their cries of revolution, conspiracy and red plots. The W.P.A. strikers have overthrown another sacred cow of capitalism, "You can't strike against the government." They did it. It remains to be seen whether they will become conscious of the real meaning of their instinctive act.

From One Great Democrat To Another
"I enter Spain, a newly-born Spain, which received a baptism of fire and blood and whose sufferings aroused the sympathy of all men and women in my own country as in all the civilized world."—Alexander Weddell, American Ambassador to Spain, on presenting his credentials to the butcher of the Spanish workers, General Franco.

SOCIALISM AND THE SOUTH

"The South is America's economic problem number one."—President Roosevelt.

TIME and again we read of the conditions of the workers in the industrial East; of strikes in the middle West; of vigilante repression of the unions on the Pacific Coast. But one section of the country that rarely gets any publicity except for vague generalizations is the South.

This section of the country presents a problem which is different from all other regions, for the South is the only section where the industrial proletariat is not an overwhelming majority of the population. On the other hand, this difference is in a measure neutralized by the fact that in the South the capitalist paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty is realized more keenly than elsewhere.

Anyone looking about the South will discern no lack of manpower. There are 36 million people in this region. Their birth rate is the highest in the country, which means a steady growth in numbers. Nor is there any paucity of physical resources. Diversified in climate and topography, the South leads the world in the production of cotton, tobacco and naval stores. It tops the nation in raw furs, phosphates and sulphur. Two-thirds of our oil and natural gas comes from the South. Mineral deposits are heavy, and fish and game fill its innumerable forests. Even the man-made means of transportation are excellent. Yet, amid this physical plenty, the average worker, share cropper, or tenant farmer lives in the misery, filth and squalor of the denizens of "Tobacco Road."

The bald truth is that the average exploited Southerner does not get enough to eat. In the rural districts the common dish is fat back, corn bread and molasses, a diet productive of pellagra and other dietary diseases. In the industrial areas the wage workers exist on a standard of living that is less than one-half the national average, which is in itself insufficient to properly feed, clothe and shelter. Most tenant farmers and wage workers below the Mason-Dixon line have less than \$49 annually for the purchase of food. Slow starvation is

the everyday mode of existence for this important section of the country.

Clothing presents no better picture. The average man in the South has less than \$14 a year to purchase wearing apparel; the average woman is "better" off—she has \$15. As for children, draw your own conclusion; no figures are available. In the land where cotton is king, the people go garbed in rags.

The National Emergency Council, a committee established by President Roosevelt to report on economic conditions throughout the country, reports that "Houses in the South are the oldest . . . have the greatest need for repairs . . . in the U. S." Southern slums, where most workers live, are without any modern improvements, have few sanitary facilities, and even lack running water in many cases. Most rural homes do not even have outdoor privies. The Council states that ". . . about one-half the families in the South, that is, four million families, should be taken from their dilapidated shelters and hovels and rehoused." (The report fails to state how!) With superb building materials available in abundance the Southern workers and other exploited elements are compelled to house themselves as though there were a dire scarcity of wood and stone, cement and steel.

"The average worker receives less than

Don't Laugh, Boys, This Guy Is Serious. "Business is the noblest profession open to intelligent Americans."—Walter Gifford, American Telephone and Telegraph Co. president, on receiving an honorary degree from Union College. Without engaging in any controversy over other fields of endeavor with Mr. Gifford as to the relative merits of the exploitation of human labor for the sake of bigger and better profits, we hardly believe that the millions of "intelligent Americans" on relief or the W.P.A. will agree with the latter part of his statement. The only thing "open," they have found, is the door out.

\$314 yearly . . . More than one-half the Southern families (53%)—tenant farmers, share croppers—have much lower incomes," says the report. Another recent study of Southern plantation conditions shows that the average tenant family has an income of \$73 yearly. Share croppers average from \$38 to \$87 per person. \$38 yearly *means less than ten cents a day!*

The National Emergency Council sums up its report on conditions in the South by saying, in substance: These intolerable conditions have been created by man and can be solved by man. But the Council admits that it knows not the solution.

The Council is correct; these horrible conditions are man-made and they can be solved by man. The plight of the share croppers, tenant farmers and workers differs in degree but not in kind with that of the rest of the country. For the past ten

years the leaders of the capitalist world have been struggling to find the solution to this pressing problem, but we still suffer in the grip of capitalism's crisis. All sorts of schemes have been tried and found wanting—pump-priming, crop destruction, bounties for non-production. The Council's report is an admission of the bankruptcy of capitalism.

The last hope of the exploited in the South lies in the success of the Socialist movement in overthrowing capitalism, socializing the industries and establishing industrial farming on the land. With the products of society made available to all, the degradation and misery of the South will be a thing of the past.

"The South is America's economic problem number one"—and *only Socialism can solve it.*

—HERBERT BRANDON

WARS — JUST AND UNJUST

THE revolutionary Socialist movement is not a pacifist movement. It does not hold that all wars have been and are wrong, all resort to arms useless. There have been time when violence was necessary and unavoidable for human progress. If the American colonists had not taken up arms against Great Britain, the United States would still be a colonial nation; if the Civil War had not been fought, chattel slavery would not have been abolished. There have been wars that speeded humanity forward and wars which tied faster the chains of slavery.

Marxism applies a yardstick by which it measures the values of all events, including wars. It asks, "Does this step increase the power of man over nature? Does it lead closer to the abolition of the exploitation of man by man? Does it bring mankind nearer to Socialism?" War is never an end in itself. Often wars have been the means by which great historic objectives were served, with or without the conscious knowledge of the participants. The Marxist passes judgment on a specific war only after he has considered its effect on society as a whole.

The aim of the revolutionary Socialist

movement is the emancipation of the working class through the abolition of capitalism. This cannot be successfully accomplished unless the workers organize their economic strength into the most powerful weapon at their disposal: an integral industrial union of the working class, capable of taking over and operating the industries of the nation. In attaining its objective, the Socialist movement prefers to use peaceful means to settle the question, but it does not reject the possibility that action by the capitalist class may not permit it any choice and that a peaceful victory may have to be safeguarded against a "pro-slavery rebellion" of the capitalist class. A war arising from such a cause would certainly receive the heartiest support of the working class movement.

In the past few years the traditional distinction which Marxists have made between progressive and reactionary wars has been used as a screen to conceal the betrayal of the working class. A "just" war, according to the Stalinist history of the Communist Party, "is a war of liberation to defend people from foreign attack and attempts to enslave them or attempts to liberate dependent countries from the yoke

of imperialism." Essentially this formulation is correct, except that the phrase "to defend people from foreign attack" is the cry all jingoes raise, and the slogan under which every people is led to slaughter, believing it is defending its country. It is the Stalinist application of a more or less correct generalization which is suicidal to the workers, for the Communist Parties throughout the world have twisted the theory of "just" wars to mean that the democratic imperialists must be supported.

Even the *New York Times* knows this. . . . Communist Parties are being ordered to support their government should war come." (May 1st). After noting this, the writer adds, "This may sound surprising, but it accords fully with the Leninist-Stalinist distinction between just and unjust wars . . ." That is what the bourgeois and their lieutenants would like us to believe—that "it accords fully" with Socialist doctrine. What would be more comforting to the war mongers than to know that the revolutionary movement against capitalism believes that an imperialist war is a just war or that the movement dedicated to the overthrow of the capitalist class would support it actively when it is most vulnerable?

What is a war of liberation today? The only war of liberation in the major capitalist nations is the class war of the working class against the capitalist class. The American working class, (likewise the French, English, Japanese, Italian, German), is not enslaved by any foreign country. The enslaver is in its own back yard, at home. Nor will the major capitalist nations participate in a war for the liberation of colonial people suffering from the "yoke of imperialism." On the contrary, any war in which the United States, or France, or Great Britain or any other so-called democratic nation engages will be for the purpose of defending or extending its own imperialist dominions. It would be fighting not to free the slaves but to safeguard its own brand of slavery.

The fact is that today even in cases where a nation defends itself, capitalism cannot possibly engage in any "just" wars. Even in the case of the defense of Czechoslovakia against the threatened invasion by

Germany the workers could make no greater error than to give up their independent program to unite with their bourgeoisie. The capitalists of Czechoslovakia, finding themselves abandoned by their supposed allies, reasoned that they could come to terms with Hitler under which their profits could be safeguarded, even though their political rights were destroyed. They were right; but with this surrender the workers of Czechoslovakia were placed in the bondage of Fascism. A more revolutionary working class party than the Stalinists or the Social Democracy would have raised the slogan of workers' control and attempted to take over the defense of the nation from the hands of the bourgeoisie. Had the workers done this and then resisted Hitler, not only would their struggle have had a possibility of success, but the support and sympathy of the entire working class throughout the world would have been aroused. Soviet Russia would have had no excuse for withholding its support. Independent action by the workers might have altered the entire picture in Europe today.

As for the so-called democracies fighting "just" wars against Fascism, let no worker be deceived: every war today must be waged on a totalitarian basis. Daladier rules by decree powers in France because of the fear of war; in England, conscription has been introduced for the first time in history; in the United States, the notorious M Plan will introduce Fascism the moment the nation enters war. And let no one deceive himself that once the capitalists have hogtied the workers during the war that they will release them when the war is over.

The working class movement cannot help colonial and semi-colonial peoples who fight liberating wars against their imperialist masters, through supporting the government of their own exploiters. The workers can and should help in their own way, by means of strikes, boycotts, etc. But above all, the workers can best help colonial peoples to victory by carrying on the struggle for their own emancipation, the revolutionary struggle against their own exploiters.

The perversion by the Stalinists of the

distinction between just and unjust wars in the attempt to steer the workers into supporting and fighting for capitalism in the coming world war should deceive no worker who is alert to the interest of his class.

—BARNEY ROBBINS

A SCAB'S REWARD

John Connolly was a scab, but he didn't care. Why should he walk off his W.P.A. job just because the other three hundred workers on his project in Rochester had struck? After all, he needed the pay; his family was in bad enough straits without having to endure the added blow of no wages for God knew how long a period. And if he were fired because of the strike, where could a fifty-four year old man turn for another job? Let the others strike against the government that was giving them work; John Connolly would stick.

"Don't let them drive down our working standards," said the pickets. "Protest against those who would cut your wages in half by making you work twice as long for your pay." But John paid no heed to the agitators. He was "loyal," and his supervisor told him that his faith would be rewarded. A better job, more pay, the commendation of the entire nation would be his. The taunts of the pickets bothered him less and less. John Connolly was happy.

Eagerly he awaited the message that would give him his new assignment. He was more than fed up with working with a gang like those strikers. And now the foreman was handing him the envelope which would permit him to get away from them. He wanted a change and at last it was coming. Quickly he tore open the envelope and read his reward:—

"Please be advised that in accordance with the 1939 act appropriating funds for W.P.A. purposes, all project workers continuously employed for a period of 18 months or more must be laid off for a period of not less than one month, or until their relief status is re-determined. In accordance therewith, you are notified that your employment with the W.P.A. is terminated, effective at once."

Slowly John Connolly put on his street

clothes. As he walked off the project, the hoots of the pickets barely penetrated his consciousness. John Connolly was thinking of his family; what would they do now?

C.I.O. TO ENTER BUILDING FIELD

Perhaps the outstanding labor news of July was Lewis's announcement that the C.I.O. will invade the construction field, long the backbone of the A.F.L. This challenge to the Building Trades Unions now seems on its way to becoming a fact.

A Construction Workers Organizing Committee, headed by Lewis' brother, has taken the field. It is understood that John L. Lewis himself will direct the ensuing struggle that the announcement presages.

In a statement, Lewis drew attention to the fact that of the more than 3 million construction workers, less than one-third are organized. He offered the following program: 1. To organize all workers in and around construction work into one organization; 2. To increase wages and to improve working conditions; 3. To eliminate unauthorized strikes and jurisdictional disputes.

The A.F.L. Building Trades Unions have been notoriously corrupt and bureaucratic, under the iron grip of autocratic labor fakers. A recent court action revealed that the International Hod Carriers Union had not held a national convention in some 15 years. This is typical of most building craft unions.

To the unwary, Lewis' proposal would appear to be a decided step forward. Besides breaking the grip of the worst gang of labor fakers in the American labor movement, it would set up a single union instead of 15 jurisdiction-squabbling craft divisions. Also, Lewis' announced purpose of organizing the unorganized is undoubtedly a most praiseworthy object.

But despite these seemingly progressive features, Lewis' move is just a "raid" to enhance his own prestige in the struggle against the A.F.L. bureaucracy. Because of its far-reaching consequences, this step cannot but undermine the solidarity of labor, breed chaos in the ranks of the workers, and play directly into the hands of labor's enemies.

PARTY NOTES

(Continued from page 2)

We are not authorized to speak for the comrades of Los Angeles but we do know that they thoroughly disapprove of and repudiate the action of the Brandon clique in dragging into a capitalist court a principled working class dispute. Moreover, these comrades have approved in principle the resolutions adopted by the Emergency Convention.

As for Comrade Booth, he is a member of our organization and prior to the publication of his name he specifically informed Brandon that he could no longer support him or his policies.

We are reproducing here the letter that Comrade Booth directed to the Brandon clique:—

'92 Carl St.,
San Francisco, California.
July 26th, 1939.

Industrial Union Party
New York, New York.

Gentlemen;

Inasmuch as both you and I know that I am in no way connected with the so-called Industrial Union Party, and this for the reason that I am in direct disagreement with your interpretation of the principles of Marxism and De Leonism, I request (and if necessary, demand) that you cease to publish my name in the official directory of the Industrial Union Party, as in the "Industrial Unionist."

Very truly yours,
(Signed) A. C. Booth."

It remains to be seen whether the Industrial Union Party will remove these names from their official directory as requested or whether they will continue to try to capitalize on fraud and deception.

BRANCH MINNEAPOLIS

We can well understand the eagerness of the Industrial Union Party to appropriate Branch Minneapolis. The Branch is proving to be a "tower of strength" in building up a real Marxist-De Leonist party. The National Office has just received a fat batch of 26 subs to LABOR POWER, the first installment on its quota of 40 in the current sub drive. Comrade

Nelson reports that the Branch expects to complete its quota very shortly. We have every confidence that this pledge will be fulfilled and that to Branch Minneapolis will go the honor of being the first branch "over the line." The Branch has been a consistent financial supporter and its check covering the subs, contributions, Publication Fund, etc., coming in these doldrum summer days, was quite a lift to the Business Department. Good work, Minneapolis comrades!

CHICAGO GROUP

Our Chicago group has been the victim of an overdose of illness and other vexing circumstances. Nevertheless the group has managed to carry on despite its handicaps.

Comrade Rubin attended the giant John L. Lewis Packing House Workers meeting and single-handed sold over 50 copies of LABOR POWER, all that were available. Comrade Rubin reports that the papers "went like hotcakes." We were the only party represented at this meeting; the other organizations were conspicuous by their absence.

The group has sent in additional subs since our last report and is well on the road to completing its quota.

Comrade Smith is taking a vacation trip to the deep South and is going well supplied with LABOR POWER and other party literature. He expects to distribute these in Southern industrial centers and is looking forward to building up a number of contacts for the party in this increasingly important sector of the industrial scene.

ABRAHAM ZIEGLER,
Provisional National Secretary

Men Over Forty Not Wanted. "Not more than one-half of the families on relief, assuming our samples to be typical, could resume immediately self-supporting status, under the most favorable employment conditions." — New York Welfare Commissioner Hodson in a report on a survey of employability made only three weeks before the start of mass firings of W.P.A. workers under the 18 months rule.

"LABOR POWER" SUSTAINING FUND

In launching our original appeal for financial support we had occasion to refer to the dictum of Daniel De Leon that "the revolutionary Press will always be in hot water" "Labor Power" is proving to be no exception to this general rule. In addition, the summer doldrums has played havoc with our collections.

In checking unpaid pledges to the Joint Publication Fund, the Business Manager finds that the widely heralded "prosperity" recorded in the financial sections of the bourgeois press has failed to seep down to our members. Moreover, total unemployment is levelling a heavy toll indirectly upon our pledges. In order to insure a steady income for "Labor Power," it becomes necessary to establish a permanent sustaining fund, secured by regular monthly contributions.

We are herewith launching the "Labor Power" Sustaining Fund, and call upon our members, sympathizers and friends to enroll in this fund by making a regular monthly pledge. Let no one refrain from participating due to the smallness of the sum he can spare. While dollars are preferable, quarters and half-dollars have a satisfactory way of adding up when sent in in abundance. Experience proves that while big sums are most important, regular contributions are the paper's backbone.

Remember, a strong, virile "Labor Power" can be a powerful bulwark against the oncoming tide of Fascism. **Do your part and Socialism will yet prevail.**

COLLECTION LISTS NOW AVAILABLE

The Business Manager has recently printed "Labor Power" collection lists for the convenience of members and readers in soliciting funds for the paper. Readers are urged to send for these lists and circulate them among their shopmates and friends. Every penny counts and it shouldn't be hard to secure funds for a fighting working class paper such as "Labor Power."

SUBSCRIPTION CARDS

Printed subscription cards are now available and readers are urged to send for a supply to secure subs with. Remember that every sub secured means a potential member of the Socialist Union Party. **Get those subscriptions!**

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE JOINT PUBLICATION FUND

The following contributions have been received for the Joint Publication Fund during the past month.

Harold Levy, \$5.00; Ben Cohen, \$1.00; Sam Fleischer, \$1.00; George Sakel, \$0.50; De Leonist, \$2.50; Mrs. Wm. Nelson, \$5.00; George Moulde, \$0.25; Peter Nelson, \$0.50; Cornelli Shoup, \$3.00.

Send orders and remittances to Business Manager, LABOR POWER, P. O. Box 4, Station T, New York, N. Y.